

REMARKS

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC 102

Claim 46

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,766,987 to Mitchell ("Mitchell").

Although the Applicants disagree with the determination of the Office regarding patentability, claim 46 has been amended to more fully describe the subject matter therein. As amended, claim 46 requires "each of said semiconductor devices being separately mounted in a pattern within said formation cavity by using a removable template comprising openings corresponding to desired locations of said semiconductor devices." Support for this limitation is found, for example, at US 2005/0062140: paragraph [0044].

Mitchell does not disclose all the limitations of claim 46. For example, Mitchell does not disclose that its microelectronic subassemblies are "separately mounted in a pattern within said formation cavity by using a removable template comprising openings corresponding to desired locations of said semiconductor devices" as required in the amended claim 46. Instead, Mitchell discloses that its microelectronic subassemblies are "placed in a regular pattern, using a straight edge or other alignment fixture or a robotic placement device." (Mitchell: col. 7, lines 53-55). Mitchell's "straight edge or other alignment fixture" is not equivalent to the template as defined in claim 46. Furthermore, Mitchell does not disclose

that the straight edge or that other alignment fixture is removable as required in claim 46. Thus, Mitchell does not disclose all the limitations of claim 46.

Because Mitchell does not disclose all the limitations of claim 46, claim 46 is not anticipated by the cited reference. Claim 46 is otherwise allowable.

35 USC 103

Claims 13, 15-19 and 42-45

Claims 13, 15-19 and 42-45 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell in view of US 6,614,103 to Durocher et al. ("Durocher"). Claim 13 is an independent claim from which claims 15-19 and 42-45 depend.

The Office correctly notes that Mitchell does not teach "said curable coating material comprising at least one phosphor." (Office Action: Page 5). In order to supply the missing limitation, the Office combines Mitchell with Durocher. The Office cites Durocher as disclosing a method of packaging semiconductor devices that are "encapsulated by a curable coating material (65) comprising at least one phosphor." (Id). Combining the references, the Office concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of Durocher to Mitchell to derive the subject matter of claim 13.

Although the Applicants disagree with the determination of the Office regarding patentability, claim 13 has been amended to more fully describe the subject matter therein. The Applicants submit that Mitchell and Durocher, taken individually or in

combination, do not teach all the limitations of amended claim 13, which was amended in a similar manner as claim 46. The Applicants submit that the arguments for the patentability of claim 46 apply to amended claim 13 with equal force. Thus, Mitchell does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 13.

Durocher also fails to teach the limitations of amended claim 13. Instead, Durocher discloses that "LED chips 59 may be attached to the carrier 31 and the electrodes 37 using any suitable flip chip bonding method." (Durocher: col. 7, lines 46-48). Durocher further discloses "LED chips 59 are placed into cavities 35 with the bonding pads 61 up, and thin metal lead wires 63 are used to electrically connect the pads 61 to the electrodes 37." (Durocher: col. 8, lines 3-6). However, Durocher does not teach or suggest that carrier 31 is removable. In fact, carrier 31 is not removable because LED chips 59 are placed into cavities 35 of carrier 31. As such, Durocher does not teach that the LED chips 59 are "separately mounted in a pattern within said formation cavity by using a removable template comprising openings corresponding to desired locations of said semiconductor devices" as required in the amended claim 13. Thus, Durocher does not teach all the limitations of claim 13.

Because Mitchell and Durocher, taken individually or in combination, do not teach all the limitations of claim 13, the claim is not rendered obvious in view of the cited references. Claim 13 is otherwise allowable.


Claims 15-19 and 42-45 depend from allowable claim 13 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 13, 15-19 and 42-46 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/16/10



Jaye Heybl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,661

KOPPEL, PATRICK, HEYBL & DAWSON
2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 215
Westlake Village, California 91361-5827
Phone 805 373 0060,
Fax 805 373 0051